



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

menace to the world's peace, and relieve the burden of taxation which is exhausting the peoples. While thus working for joint action to this imperative end, we demand that there shall be no increase in our own naval program.

We call upon our Massachusetts press, churches, and all agencies of public influence to unite in promoting this high endeavor; and we resolve that copies of this declaration be sent to the President of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Pacific Coast Department.

Robert Cromwell Root, A. M., Director of our Pacific Coast Department, has recently issued fifteen reasons why war is wrong. The reasons, together with certain references, are as follows:

War is wrong because—

1. "Peace is the normal condition of society, and war is a reversion to barbarism."¹
2. War is an appeal to might instead of right, and sets aside reason and justice, law and order, for the "mailed fist" and bloody conflict.
3. War sets up false standards of courage, false ideals of patriotism, perverts the teachings of Christianity, and destroys the bonds of human brotherhood.
4. War selects and destroys the "most fit" among men, and thus weakens the whole human race.²
5. War dooms millions to celibacy, prevents home-making and the development of home virtues, and thus lowers the normal birth-rate and robs society of "an ever-widening wedge of citizens that might have been."
6. War's unnatural camp life encourages immorality and vice, and produces thousands upon thousands of "fallen men" tainted with foul diseases,^{3,4} who in turn blight the lives of thousands of innocent wives and children.
7. War's evils and debaucheries were the spawning bed from which sprang the abominable "white slave traffic" and its inseparable evil, the licensed liquor traffic of the United States. While war remains, a strong demand for this vile slavery will remain.
8. War robs helpless mothers of their sons, wives of their husbands, sweethearts of their lovers, and innocent children of their fathers—their rightful, God-given protectors. War also robs the school, the church, the State, and does not and cannot give any adequate compensation for any of these losses.
9. War sets up pagan rules for the Golden Rule, and substitutes narrow selfishness and ignorant jingoism for true patriotism and statesmanlike internationalism.
10. War impoverishes humanity⁵ by misusing the world's chief energies in causing waste and death and destruction, instead of rightly using those energies in preventing fires, floods, accidents, and diseases, and in doing *constructive* work for the benefit of mankind.
11. War is needless,⁶ since the world now has in operation and in process of development adequate means for settling all disputes without resort to war; furthermore, war itself does not settle any question properly or justly.
12. War is barbarous,⁷ for it slaughters men, and inflicts cruelties and tortures on innocent women and children who did nothing to cause the war, and yet suffer most from it.
13. War is wicked, for it violates every moral principle, every righteous law of man, every instinct of civilized humanity and every command of God.^{8,9}
14. War shamelessly glories in its own wickedness that ruthlessly disregards human rights, brutalizes men, incites to inhuman cruelties, and makes man, not his "brother's keeper," but his brother's wolf-like destroyer.¹⁰
15. War is cruel, wicked, barbarous, needless, inhuman, and devilish, for it commits every sin in the decalogue; and yet war does not in this age serve one single useful purpose that cannot be served better in a humane way. On the contrary, "war does all that the devil would do if run stark mad,"¹¹ for "war is hell," and hell serves neither God nor man, but ever and only the devil.

Ergo, bellum delendum est.

(Therefore, war must be destroyed.)

References.

- ¹ Ex-President Theodore Woolsey, of Yale, in "International Law."
- ² "The Human Harvest," David Starr Jordan.
- ^{3,4} Rev. Walter Walsh, in "Moral Damage of War," pp. 151-152.
- ⁵ President David Starr Jordan, in "The Unseen Empire."
- ⁶ Arthur W. Allen, in "The Drain of Armaments."
- ⁷ President Theodore Roosevelt, May, 1908, speech at laying corner-stone of Bureau of American Republics, "There is no question but what may be settled by arbitration."
- ^{8,9,10} Wilhelm Lamszus, in "The Human Slaughterhouse."
- ¹¹ Lord Byron, in "Don Juan."

The "Typical Case" Again.

In our last number, under the title "A Typical Case," we printed a letter from a distinguished southern gentleman which set forth his philosophy on the peace movement. We published replies to this letter from such persons as Mr. Hamilton Holt, Dr. Charles W. Eliot, and Hon. Jackson H. Ralston. We are glad to print two more communications.

Dr. Charles F. Dole, of Jamaica Plain, Mass., expresses his views thus:

If your Southern correspondent is truly a "Christian," the answer to his letter becomes extremely simple. If there is one thing above all others that marks a Christian, it is what we know as "the spirit of Christ"—in other words, a constant good will, a friendly attitude toward every one.

All Jesus' repeated utterances about forgiveness may be summed up into one rule, namely, to have no enemies. Already today many of us have no enemies. We even require our policemen and officers of the law, representing the civilized sense of the people, to treat no unfortunate criminal as an enemy. We allow no one in our best force of teachers to hold any backward or wayward pupil as an enemy. Enmity is barbarous.

Now this spirit or attitude—the supreme law of religion—summarily disposes of war or "armed peace," the essence of either of which is enmity, suspicion, race or color prejudice, annoyance, greed, fear—in general, the heathen attitude. Keep the attitude of friendliness toward all peoples; wish for nothing that does not fairly belong to you; trust the Golden Rule as between nations—in a word, be "Christians"—and you have no reason for maintaining a war establishment.

This holds specially of the position of the United States. We are situated as to have no excuse for engaging in the barbarous struggles and anomalous political qualms of such unfortunate peoples as the Balkan States. We are also supposing that our American Christians are not hypocrites, but honest believers in the supreme law of the Golden Rule, and that they mean more than idle words in saying: Thy will—the good will—be done. If Christianity is not real to the people who profess it in churches—if Christians are not committed by their principles to stop war—we need a new religion that can and will stop war and other abuses.

Neither do we propose to go back to historical precedents in order to find "righteous" wars. Most history, any way, is the story of what ought never again to be done. Neither do we care to deny that incidental good may have come out of war. What we affirm is that we ought now as civilized "Christians" to know better than

to fight. Our position is like that of a town which has at last discovered the conditions of typhoid fever. We praise the doctors and nurses who have fought the fever. We tell grand stories of heroism in the course of the epidemics. We grant that in ignorant parts of the world there may yet occur visitations of the disease. But we do not propose to make any more elaborate arrangements even to fight the fever. We intend not to have it; we will put an end to the conditions which bring it.

So with war. We ought now to know how not to have war. Surely in the United States, one of its predisposing conditions is big armaments. They predispose to war, precisely as the doubling up of the fist predisposes to a quarrel, whereas the attitude of justice and a friendly temper make and keep the peace. Moreover, we purpose in case of a threatening difference of opinion to use The Hague Tribunal.

This distinctly means that we in the United States do not need to wait for other nations in order to put offensive armaments out of commission. We do not need to wait for others before being honest or truthful or kindly. We will simply do what the strong and intelligent man always does—namely, not look for a quarrel, not feel fear of being attacked, and not carry weapons to provoke his neighbors.

Is not this a fair answer to those who propose to be "Christians?" Be Christians, then, and see if a nation of Christian men, like the brave and strong individual man, is not safer with justice and a constant humane interest than it ever has been when armed to the teeth and in chronic apprehension of its neighbors!

Lucia Ames Mead writes as follows:

"The distinguished gentleman from the South," whose letter in the last *ADVOCATE* expresses certain very common misapprehensions, may find less difficulty when he learns that we distinguish between past and future war and civil and international war. They are in four different categories, all too often confused with dangerous results. One side in some past wars have been right; but if so, the other side was wrong, and the war as a whole could never have been more than fifty per cent just. No future war, if it be between any of the forty-four signatory powers at The Hague, can have excuse for even one side, as more than one substitute for war now exists. No recognized substitute yet exists to prevent civil war, and therefore in future civil war one side might be excused for defending itself against wanton attack. But past or future civil war and past international war must be judged as at best no more "righteous" than a half-rotten apple can be called good.

Peace advocates condemn war, not primarily because it promotes pain, but because it promotes injustice and never aims at a judicial decision. War simply proves who is stronger. Rival armies and navies are the tools of nations preparing for international duelling. The supposed analogy with police has done vast harm. The police of one city never fight the police of another city, nor the militia of one State the militia of another State. They both use the minimum of force to get men to court and their type of force will persist, and some time replace rival armies and navies by a small international police.

Thousands of well-educated citizens are still outside our peace ranks, because they have never seen through the false euphemisms and false analogies with which so many editors have befogged the subject, especially as regards "righteous wars" and "the navy as police."

While not asking for the impossible—immediate disarmament—we ought to demand that the safest nation on earth, which itself forced every foreign war it ever had, should have the courage to lead in the decrease of its monstrous armaments which excite suspicion, incite to heavier burdens in other lands, and imply a disgraceful timidity and fear of non-existent foes.

Democracy and the Jew in Russia.

By Arthur Deerin Call.

War thrives where the people are unhappy. No apology is needed, therefore, for calling attention to one aspect of the distressing situation in a sister nation. The modern spirit of liberalism or democracy is very much alive in Russia. A constitution was granted at St. Petersburg in 1905. Being over twice as large as the United States and constituting the largest single political area of the world, its natural resources, its rivers and harbors, its mines and fields are all calculated to support a great and a progressive people. The population of Russia today is approximately 150 millions. Especially hopeful is the class represented by the intellectuals, the progressive party of Russia. The artists, especially among the literary class, have for fifty years been of the highest order. One has but to recall the satires of Shtchedrin, the somber classic pen-pictures of Turgenieff, the breadth and sympathy of Tolstoi and his friend Menshikoff, the Emersonian touch of Melshim, to demonstrate the high reach of the intellectual leaders there. There are reasons for believing that the next ten years will witness one of the most remarkable and hopeful national developments in Russia of all history.

But there are elements in that broad country making for a decided discouragement. For example, 70 per cent of that great population is illiterate. Many of those in political authority are avowedly afraid to provide education for the unfortunate peasants. There is an iron and a despotic hand held over Poland and Finland. Religious persecutions, strangely mediæval, are still common, now against the Baptists, now against the Roman Catholics, but especially against the Jews, of whom there are in the whole land less than six million. We all remember the horrible massacres at Kechineff. It is difficult for intelligent people to understand the policy of "gagging" the press, so common in Russia. There are reasons for accepting the statement that the Russian government seems to be simply an autocracy limited only by assassination. It sounds very strange to our modern ears that Jewish prostitute women are allowed in St. Petersburg, while Jewish student women are forbidden to live there. The grounds for persecuting the Jews have shifted many times from religious to economic, to political, to personal. Absurd class legislation is still common in that land—for example, Jews are forbidden to serve as superintendents of sugar-beet plantations. The government does not permit families with grown